

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-8, and 16-17 are pending in the present application. In the present Amendment, Claims 16 and 17 are amended without introducing any new matter to correct minor formal issues.

In the October 27, 2008 Office Action, Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, and 3-8 were allowed.

The December 26, 2008 Advisory Action indicated that the Amendment filed on December 12, 2008 raised new issues that require further search and/or consideration, and therefore did not enter the Amendment. In addition, the Advisory Action indicated that the rejection of Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, was not overcome.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in the Office Action of October 27, 2008.

In response to the rejection of Claim 16 for formal issues under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Claim 16 is amended to recite that the “third logic means [is] processing said original foreground image signals ... to generate a first superposed image,” and to recite “superposing said peripheral edge regions of said low-pass filtered foreground image ... to generate a second superposed image.” In light of the recital of a first and second superposed image, the claim is further formally amended to delete the portions directed to “result of said superposing” with the respective first and second superposed image. No new matter has been added.

In light of the amendments to independent Claim 16, Applicants respectfully traverse the formal rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and request reconsideration thereof.

In response to the rejection of Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, independent Claim 17 is amended to clarify that the computer readable storage medium includes a program that is stored on the medium, and the program can cause a system including a *graphics synthesizer* and a *vector unit* to perform a method. In addition, the steps of the method are amended to recite on which hardware element they are performed, either the vector unit of the Emotion Engine 100 or the Graphics Synthesizer 200. These features find non-limiting support in Applicants' disclosure as originally filed, for example at least in Figures 2-4, and in the specification from at p. 7, l. 25, to p. 10, l. 31. For example, the specification explains that the alpha blending unit 260 of the Graphics Synthesizer 200 can perform alpha blending for transparency effects. (Specification, starting at p. 10, l. 26). In addition, the specification explains that the step of generating original foreground image signals can be performed by the Emotion Engine 100, where the vector unit 108 is used. (Specification, from p. 14, l. 14, to p. 15, l. 15.). Moreover, the step of "applying anti-aliasing filtering to edges" is explained, and that it can be performed on the Graphics Synthesizer 200. (Specification, p. 15, ll. 16-20.) The remaining steps "first processing said primitive-processed image signals," "second processing said original foreground image signals," and "outputting said display signal for displaying said anti-aliased foreground image" are also described in the specification, and that they can be performed on the Graphics Synthesizer 200. (Specification, p. 15, l. 32, to p. 17, l. 15.)

Moreover, the specification makes clear that these method steps can be implemented as a processing software, and because the method steps have been explained in clearly sufficient detail for one of ordinary skill in the art how to make and/or use them with

reference to different hardware processing units, for example the Graphic Synthesizer 200 and the Emotion Engine 100, it is also clear that one of ordinary skill in the art would know how to implement such a software that could be stored onto a computer readable storage medium. (Specification, p. 17, ll. 16-18.) This contention is further supported by Claims 12-15 as originally filed.

In light of the amendments to independent Claim 17, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and request reconsideration thereof.

Consequently, in light of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 08/07)

RFF/rac



Bradley D. Lytle

Attorney of Record

Registration No. 40,073

Nikolaus P. Schibli, Ph.D.

Registered Patent Agent

Registration No. 56,994